

(b)(1) (b)(3) (b)(6)

CIA's Use of Polygraphy in Personnel Screening

Report to the Director of Central Intelligence The DCI's Blue Ribbon Panel on the Polygraph

CONFIDENTIAL

APPROVED FOR RELEASE DATE: 29-May-2012

ii / CONFIDENTIAL

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
(2) The DCI's Blue Ribbon Polygraph Panel was commissioned to review the Agency's
use of the polygraph in employee selection and staff reinvestigation. In his charge to the
Panel, the DCI asked us to meet with representatives from across the Agency and from
other Intelligence Community agencies. We spent a great deal of time comparing CIA's
use of polygraphy to that of and because those agencies' employee pools are
most similar to CIA's, and they also use screening polygraphs. We traveled to the
to see first-hand the basic training all US
Government examiners receive. We listened to the stories of some Agency employees,
and their counsel from the ACLU, who have had problems clearing the reinvestigation
process. We heard from senior Agency officials responsible for security and
counterintelligence. We also met with representatives of
(6) We agree that CIA has a continuing most for the polygraph, and that CIA's polygraph
(E) We agree that CIA has a continuing need for the polygraph, and that CIA's polygraph
program is, overall, headed in the right direction. We were favorably impressed by the
corps of examiners, and especially by their perseverance
In general, we believe the Agency owes its
counterintelligence and security officers a large debt for their willingness to soldier on,
often without thanks. We believe Agency-wide recognition of their critical contributions
is both in order and overdue. And we believe the Agency should seek to make their
career tracks as desirable and as influential as other careers in the Agency.
We have reached one overarching conclusion: the Agency relies far too heavily on the polygraph. Experts tell us the polygraph is at best only about 86 percent accurate. CIA espouses the "whole person" concept, under which all sources of information about an employee or applicant are considered and weighed, but reality is that the polygraph results carry disproportionate weight. Such over-reliance on a single test frequently has a deleterious impact on individual careers and on the organization's morale. We propose a number of specific changes designed to address over-reliance. Other changes we discussed range from increasing the focus on management accountability as it pertains to security and CI issues to improving the physical environment in which Agency polygraphers work. We understånd why Agency managers have come to rely so extensively on the polygraph
current program is too high.
current program is too mgm.

	We strongly recommend that the Agency's senior managers undertake and detailed outreach process for all employees to educate them in the poly and procedures. We believe that practice of training "security coord each business area is worth emulating. Humans hate that which they do no therefore, with understanding comes acceptance. Demystifying the polygra bringing security to the desk of each employee, we believe, will increase the acceptance of its necessity and its value. In addition, we recommend that a Agency managers be educated in the process and appeal/complaint possibility.	ygraph process linators" in t understand; aph and ne population's ll levels of
	chairman	<u>-</u>
_		 -
_	·	
_		_ ·
_		- ·
		•
		-
	•	-
_		-

PURPOSE

(2) In July 1999, DCI George Tenet commissioned a Blue Ribbon Panel of distinguished representatives from government and the private sector to review the Agency's use of the polygraph in employee selection and staff reinvestigation. Addressing the group's inaugural meeting, the DCI noted that the Agency is committed to recruiting and retaining "the best and brightest" workforce, and does not want anything to unfairly hamper achievement of this goal. The Panel was asked to address these questions: Whether CIA's use of the polygraph is in accord with federal standards and best practices?

•	Is CIA placing undue reliance on polygraph results?
•	Does CIA's use of polygraphy maintain the correct balance between the demands of
	national security and the appropriate treatment of individuals?
•	Are there preferable options to the polygraph?
Œ	The panel is supported by a staff director and detailees from the.
~	
	ope of Work
	The panel met biweekly from August 1999 through January 2000, with subcommittee
	d individual panel members conducting far-reaching research and investigation.
וח	ghlights of these activities include:
•	Panel members were briefed by senior managers and polygraph professionals.
•	Members met with senior Agency executives (DDO, DDA, C/NE, C/CIC, as well as retired senior DO officers).
_	Tetried senior DO officers).
•	
	The DS&T's primary research specialist briefed
•	the Panels
	<u>ene_i antois</u>
	Members also witnessed the quality control process between
	examiner and team leader.
•	One Panel member requested and was administered an EOD polygraph examination.
•	Members traveled to the
	for briefings and interviews.
•	Panel members met with representatives of employee affinity groups to obtain their
	views on how such issues as race, culture and ethnicity relate to the polygraph
	process.
•	We heard briefings on how polygraph results are used in the personnel security
	adjudication process

Members met with senior managers,	
to discuss the referral process and Section 811 of the Foreign Intelligence	
Authorization Act of 1995.	
employees, accompanied by ACLU attorney	met
with the Panel to discuss process issues based on their personal experiences.	•
• The Staff Director attended an international conference on interviewing and	
interrogation hosted by Dr. (renowned academician and author of	
·	
• Panel members reviewed scores of significant cases, research and background	
material; they also reviewed	
some problematic cases.	
Panel Members	
Chairman:	
	i

Introduction

The success of the US Intelligence Community rests on three pillars: collection and operations, analysis, and security. While the three pillars are of equal importance, security is perhaps the most difficult to get right. Because of its nature, and because of the lack of discernible results, security is frequently relegated to a back burner. Moreover, in a democracy, security necessarily involves balancing the rights of the individual against the security needs of the nation.

The Intelligence Community must recruit and retain the best and brightest the nation has to offer. It must take risks—sometimes very large risks—to protect our nation. Sometimes those risks are physical, but they can also be intellectual or policy risks. It follows, therefore, that the Community's security pillar must also consist of the best and the brightest if it is to face successfully its particularly difficult challenges. The security services are in a constant tug of war between individual liberty and national security. But in addition, they must cope with a collective work force that may acknowledge the need for security but does not always honor that need with respect for the process and those who administer it.

We wish to note that some Panel members were inclined to believe, at the outset of our deliberations, that serious consideration should be given to the complete elimination of the polygraph requirement. At the end of our deliberations, no member of the Panel held that view. The evidence is overwhelming that the polygraph, in the hands of a skilled examiner, is a very useful tool to elicit information from an applicant or an employee that might otherwise be obtained only after lengthy and costly investigation—or not at all. At the same time, the Panel is very concerned that the cost of acquiring this information is quite high. This report attempts to identify key problem areas and provide reasonable recommendations and options that will reduce the negative impact of the polygraph, while allowing continued use of the polygraph as a meaningful safeguard for Agency and national security interests.

(C) Although the Panel was not asked to address the broader issues of security and counterintelligence, it is clear to us that management must continue to work to improve CI and security. Polygraphers—the focus of our study—must be included in the IC's effort to improve working conditions for CI and security officers, but they are only a part. Senior management of the Intelligence Community must ensure that all security and CI officers have a career path that assures them adequate promotion and education opportunities. CI and security professionals must have choice assignments and be competitive with officers from the more glamorous parts of the Community. And they must know that they enjoy the full confidence of management.

(2) The Panel believes the DCI was prudent in asking for a review of the polygraph. In the course of our work, we discovered several areas that need correction, but we reached

one overarching conclusion: the Agency places far too much reliance on the
polygraph.
Most of our observations and recommendations are polygraph-specific and address issues such as examiner selection and training. But the Panel believes that the security structure—composed of various disciplines, such as physical, information, and personnel security—must develop a synergy to support these individual specialties. security officers, for instance, need to be well-versed in personnel security issues and serve as honest brokers for personnel security concerns within the components in which they serve. Even more broadly, the concept that security and CI matters are responsibilities shared by all Agency employees and contractors should be second nature for everyone at the Agency. We believe that the recommendations contained in this report should be widely discussed and adopted.
The Panel reached the following major conclusions:
1:
2. Far too many employees have had difficulty passing a reinvestigation polygraph, when there was little or no corroborating evidence of wrongdoing
3.
Castion 911

Section 811
(Le) Section 811 of the Foreign Intelligence Act of 1995 (codified as Counterintelligence and Security Enhancements Act of 1994, 50 U.S.C. 402a) requires, in part:

report to the FBI receipt of any information, regardless of its origin, which indicates that classified information is being or may have been disclosed in an unauthorized manner to a foreign power or an agent thereof.	
4. We believe that the aggressive use of the polygraph has precluded able Americans from working at CIA, and perhaps at other Community agencies. Although the Panel found no specific evidence that the polygraph disadvantaged any particular group of Americans, we remain concerned that the security process—including the polygraph—may in some cases prematurely reject candidates who, upon further investigation, wou qualify for employment and be granted a clearance. In still other instances we are concerned that the process may become so distasteful that highly qualified applicants j give up and return to their universities or places of employment with negative feelings about the Agency. This obviously hampers the Agency's ability to recruit from the best academic institutions, research labs and private industry.	ust
5. The Panel met with many polygraphers and was deeply impressed by their dedication pride and commitment to their mission. However, much can be done to make CIA's polygraph corps even better. We make specific training recommendations, including special efforts to educate them in the different cultures and duties found in the Agency While we reject the notion that a polygrapher must be a scientist, computer expert or confficer to effectively test one, we recognize that lack of knowledge, could cause a polygrapher to regard routine behavior as suspicious. This, in turn, leads CIA officers to disparage the process—and the examine	ase
5 /	

6. CIA polygraph techniques are more aggressive than those of other agencies. CIA polygraphers take understandable pride in the number of admissions of misconduct they elicit, but the Panel is not persuaded that other methods, more in tune with management objectives, could not produce equally satisfactory results without the associated negative costs.

7. The Panel believes that the polygraph examination should not be a hostile
Panel members also heard complaints that employees felt they were being interrogated and humiliated. We believe CI objectives can be pursued without such an approach. We believe an examiner should never mislead an examinee or engage in conduct that could be seen as aggressive or badgering.
8. Finally, we believe that Agency management must be involved throughout the reinvestigation process, including in issues raised by the polygraph. Too often, management abdicates its responsibility to value the "whole person" concept by over-reliance on the polygraph and by not encouraging further investigative efforts
This often confronts managers with tough decisions, and when they make these decisions, they should do so confident that they will be supported by senior leaders of the Agency.
The Panel's overall assessment of the Agency's polygraph program is positive. The observations and recommendations contained in this report are not intended as criticism of the entire program. Indeed, many of our comments address systemic problems with management's perception of the polygraph and the resulting over-reliance. While the panel heard of abuses, excesses, or other failures directly attributable to polygraph, we believe that these are the exceptions rather than the norm. Nonetheless, these failures create great controversy and do great harm—to the recruitment effort, employee careers and morale. As such they cannot be ignored. The system will never be perfect, but that must be our goal.
A word must also be said about the resource issue. If the Agency is committed to establishing the Government's premier personnel security program, resources must be devoted to of those officers who fulfill that mission. Although this commitment in resources may be large, it pales in comparison to the costs associated with failures in determining who is suitable to be granted and retain access to extremely sensitive information. Also, the Agency needs to take a leadership role by investing in research of alternate means of detecting deception.
As noted above, the Panel reviewed a large number of cases in recent years in which the polygraph played a key—and sometimes the only—role in discovering very significant information about applicants, contractors and employees. The Panel believes

significant information about applicants, contractors and employees. The Panel believes

great value to the Agency and the nation. These cases highlight the invalual contribution the polygraph makes to the clearance adjudication process. Our of the value of the polygraph as a tool to continue to help produce this infortheme that permeates the report.	the Agency and the nation. These cases highlight the invaluable ne polygraph makes to the clearance adjudication process. Our recognition the polygraph as a tool to continue to help produce this information is a		

THE POLYGRAPH PROCESS (2) The polygraph continues to be a controversial investigative technique, both within	
(x) The polygraph continues to be a controversial investigative technique, both within	
and outside of CIA. Proponents of the polygraph argue that it is the most effective	
information-gathering procedure available, while detractors point to its lack of	
scientifically established validity and say the process is intrusive and violates personal	
privacy. CIA and other entities in the Intelligence Community use the polygraph for	
personnel screening	
(applicants and employees) The Panel reviewed use of	•
the polygraph in personnel security screening only.	
Background (2) The polygraph is a multi-channel instrument that measures and records certain physiological characteristics of an individual. Specifically, the polygraph instrument records physiological reactions. These include the respiratory patterns of the upper and lower chest; the galvanic skin response (GSR—changes in skin resistance); and the relative blood volume pressure (changes in the average volume of the systolic/diastolic	
blood pressure). All of these reactions are traced on a continuously running chart	
The examine	r
is a critical element in the successful completion of a polygraph examination.	ļ
	٦
	- 1

		~				

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					7
Y 1	12.7					
n reaching an or	inion, the dvn	namics of the	examiner/e	examinee rel	ationship	
	nlare	a amitical mala	in 4h a			
.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	piay a	a critical role	in the proc	ess.		

CONFIDENTIAL

The	e arguments in favor of screening polygraphs are based on, its utility (most
porta	ant), its deterrent effect, and the cost effectiveness of the process.
	s throughout the Intelligence Community agree that the polygraph process elicits
porta	ant information that is often not obtained by other investigative methods
	In February 1994, the Joint Security ssion reported:
,111111	ssion reported.
,	The utility of the polygraph in eliciting important adjudicative information
	is not in doubt
) We	believe, however, that many, if not most of the Agency population is unaware of
poly	graph's efficacy.
ια	The Devel strongly ranges that associated with mains and formal all
(V)	The Panel strongly urges that, consistent with privacy safeguards, the ncy population should receive education regarding the value of the
	graph as it relates to the integrity of the work force and ultimate
POL	tection of the Agency's mission.
	······································
	(The Panel
pro	The Panel eves that if employees are aware of many recent cases, they would be more

supportive of the process, which in turn would improve CI and security in the Agency.
The argument is frequently made that the polygraph process has a deterrent effect. Applicants who believe that the polygraph will elicit disqualifying information may be deterred from applying. Cleared personnel may be deterred from misconduct because they know they will be required to take a polygraph in the future
Agencies that use the polygraph to screen applicants point to use of the process as an efficient and effective cost-containment tool. Disqualifying admissions made during the polygraph process obviate the need to conduct a time-consuming, resource intense and expensive background investigation.
Further investigation and consideration—should be pursued. Such a process assures that qualified applicants are not rejected out of hand and that the Agency truly applies the "whole person" concept.
Over-Reliance and The "Whole Person" Concept (C) CIA advocates the "whole person" concept, which calls on the adjudicator to look at the data in an applicant's or employee's BI, Financial Disclosure Form (FDF), credit report (CR), results of personal interview (PI) and any other relevant sources to assist in making the clearance decision,
(C) However noble the intent of the "whole person" concept, the Panel remains concerned that over-reliance on the polygraph as an all-purpose vetting tool continues to exist.
he Panel is concerned that over-reliance on the polygraph may have a
detrimental effect



Over-Reliance—In the Applicant Process
(E) After the DCI's Recruitment Center makes a conditional offer of staff employment to
a promising candidate, the candidate completes the Standard Form SF86.
Concurrently, the Recruitment Center schedules the candidate for a full-
scope polygraph examination.
For the applicant the polygraph experience constitutes the first security
interview and, aside from general instructions and a candor statement, is often the first
real contact with CIA beyond initial discussions with a recruiter. As such, it must be one
that creates confidence and a sense of professionalism.
A candidate who is disapproved on the basis of security processing has a formal right to appeal that decision.
A candidate who is disapproved on the basis of security processing has a formal right to appeal that decision.
A candidate who is disapproved on the basis of security processing has a formal right to appeal that decision. All adjudicative decisions are based on strict adherence to DCID 6/4 (formerly DCID)
A candidate who is disapproved on the basis of security processing has a formal right to appeal that decision.
A candidate who is disapproved on the basis of security processing has a formal right to appeal that decision. (C) All adjudicative decisions are based on strict adherence to DCID 6/4 (formerly DCID 1/14). This Directive stipulates adjudicative guidelines for approving security clearances.
A candidate who is disapproved on the basis of security processing has a formal right to appeal that decision. (C) All adjudicative decisions are based on strict adherence to DCID 6/4 (formerly DCID 1/14). This Directive stipulates adjudicative guidelines for approving security clearances. Additionally, psychologists from the Office of Medical Services (OMS),
A candidate who is disapproved on the basis of security processing has a formal right to appeal that decision. (C) All adjudicative decisions are based on strict adherence to DCID 6/4 (formerly DCID 1/14). This Directive stipulates adjudicative guidelines for approving security clearances. Additionally, psychologists from the Office of Medical Services (OMS), attorneys from OGC and computer experts from re available to provide guidance to
A candidate who is disapproved on the basis of security processing has a formal right to appeal that decision. (C) All adjudicative decisions are based on strict adherence to DCID 6/4 (formerly DCID 1/14). This Directive stipulates adjudicative guidelines for approving security clearances. Additionally, psychologists from the Office of Medical Services (OMS),
A candidate who is disapproved on the basis of security processing has a formal right to appeal that decision. (C) All adjudicative decisions are based on strict adherence to DCID 6/4 (formerly DCID 1/14). This Directive stipulates adjudicative guidelines for approving security clearances. Additionally, psychologists from the Office of Medical Services (OMS), attorneys from OGC and computer experts from re available to provide guidance to adjudicators.
A candidate who is disapproved on the basis of security processing has a formal right to appeal that decision. All adjudicative decisions are based on strict adherence to DCID 6/4 (formerly DCID 1/14). This Directive stipulates adjudicative guidelines for approving security clearances. Additionally, psychologists from the Office of Medical Services (OMS), attorneys from OGC and computer experts from a variable to provide guidance to adjudicators. Management involvement provides a vehicle by
A candidate who is disapproved on the basis of security processing has a formal right to appeal that decision. All adjudicative decisions are based on strict adherence to DCID 6/4 (formerly DCID 1/14). This Directive stipulates adjudicative guidelines for approving security clearances. Additionally, psychologists from the Office of Medical Services (OMS), attorneys from OGC and computer experts from a variable to provide guidance to adjudicators. (C) Management involvement provides a vehicle by which the interested component can be more directly involved in accepting responsibility
A candidate who is disapproved on the basis of security processing has a formal right to appeal that decision. All adjudicative decisions are based on strict adherence to DCID 6/4 (formerly DCID 1/14). This Directive stipulates adjudicative guidelines for approving security clearances. Additionally, psychologists from the Office of Medical Services (OMS), attorneys from OGC and computer experts from a variable to provide guidance to adjudicators. Management involvement provides a vehicle by
A candidate who is disapproved on the basis of security processing has a formal right to appeal that decision. All adjudicative decisions are based on strict adherence to DCID 6/4 (formerly DCID 1/14). This Directive stipulates adjudicative guidelines for approving security clearances. Additionally, psychologists from the Office of Medical Services (OMS), attorneys from OGC and computer experts from a variable to provide guidance to adjudicators. (C) Management involvement provides a vehicle by which the interested component can be more directly involved in accepting responsibility

CONFUENTIAL

	We support and	
encourage the	role to involve management constructively at such ar	1
early stage of the process.	•	
Over-Reliance—In the Rei (C) that have had a positive importaining to polygraph, whi improvements. We strongly	has embarked on several initiatives, fully described below, act on the number of employees whose reinvestigation red. The Panel also makes recommendations specifically the believe may produce additional substantive urge that these options be fully explored. manifests itself in the reinvestigations arena just as it does in	n
managers. who may become (a) The Panel believes t deal with the concerns of reinvestigation process, they understand the Ag personal experience or l	ere is considerable disparity in the approach taken by Agency aware of difficulties formally—or informally by the employee. That Agency managers should be better prepared to expressed by employees who have difficulty in the Courses for managers should be developed to ensure ency's polygraph process and do not speak only from bias. Managers should be taught how to help counsel know where to turn for additional assistance.	
(Q)		
employee without undermining	have an important responsibility to support and counsel the ng the organizational processes established to resolve the	
area(s) of concern.		
must be more directly in security concerns for all	ocess, the panel strongly believes that management avolved in accepting responsibility for CI and employees. must become accountable	



ŝta	The Panel notes that applicants are told they must be totally candid. A similar atement, issued by the Agency's most senior management team, might also send the appropriate signal to all employees	-
(Ø	The Panel believes that	
	he polygraph is a tool, and it must be companied by other investigative methods.	
	We recommend expanded use of specialized interviews, financial investigations, operational reviews, and in some cases OMS intervention, to address problem cases.	

(C) In sum, the over-reliance problem is deep-seated in the Agency	
(c) The Agency must articulate the primary goals of the polygraph program and support those goals by word and practice	onn.

confidential

CONFIDENTIAL	<u></u>	
 18 CONFIDENTIAL		



POLYGRAPH EXAMIN	ERS
Prerequisites, Selection, Basic Training	
The Panel believes that one of the most critical, if n	
ensure a professional, well-respected polygraph program	
possible candidates as polygraphers. Polygraphy is a be-	
dynamics of human interaction in a stressful interview success.	situation is the foundation of its
success.	
(The Panel recommends that	identify
critical examiner attributes/qualities	JAGO AND
Cittles Cauminos actinoscos questivos	
i i	ordinate with the Office of
Medical Services to identify selection tools for the	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	-
(2) Furthermore, in addition to meeting all other require	
examiner applicants should be at least 25 years of age at	nd hold an earned baccalaureate
degree from an accredited four-year college.	
(C) The Panel strongly believes that basic interview, con	mmunication and elicitation
skills—	can best be
developed through experience as an investigator. The m	
hone these skills, the greater the likelihood of developin	
We heard compelling testimony—	that prior
investigative experience should be a prerequisite for ent	
1	
(E) After hearing from senior Agency officials	
	ves that the Agency's
polygraph program must take steps to ensure tha	Ŭ ,•
profession have proven investigative skills and ap	
investigative experience.	

eloped information elicitation an	CIA examiners must have highly
soped information electation an	d interpersonal skins.
	rear programmes
-	uggests that there will always be differences of
	anner in which interviews are conducted.
ertheless, it is critical to ensure t	nat Agency examiners have the nest training
	mat rigority examiners have the best training
	mat regency examiners have the best duming
ible.	
ible. In the Panel's opinion, the	continuing education of examiners must
sible. In the Panel's opinion, the	continuing education of examiners must
sible. In the Panel's opinion, the include an array of courses tha	continuing education of examiners must
Sible. In the Panel's opinion, the include an array of courses that I'hen, through a variety of cou	continuing education of examiners must
ible. In the Panel's opinion, the nclude an array of courses that then, through a variety of courses.	continuing education of examiners must
Sible. In the Panel's opinion, the include an array of courses that Then, through a variety of coubbuilding courses,	continuing education of examiners must at focus on techniques rses, examiners should participate in skills-
In the Panel's opinion, the include an array of courses that Then, through a variety of coubuilding courses, Once polygraphers have co	continuing education of examiners must at focus on techniques rses, examiners should participate in skills-ompleted their basic training, the Panel
Sible. (2) In the Panel's opinion, the include an array of courses that Then, through a variety of coubuilding courses, (2) Once polygraphers have cobelieves in concert wi	continuing education of examiners must at focus on techniques rses, examiners should participate in skills- empleted their basic training, the Panel ith other appropriate Agency components,
In the Panel's opinion, the include an array of courses that Then, through a variety of coubuilding courses, Once polygraphers have could be in concert wi	continuing education of examiners must at focus on techniques rses, examiners should participate in skills- empleted their basic training, the Panel ith other appropriate Agency components,
Sible. (2) In the Panel's opinion, the include an array of courses that Then, through a variety of coubuilding courses, (2) Once polygraphers have cobelieves in concert wi	rses, examiners should participate in skills- empleted their basic training, the Panel ith other appropriate Agency components,
Sible. (2) In the Panel's opinion, the include an array of courses that Then, through a variety of coubuilding courses, (2) Once polygraphers have cobelieves in concert wishould develop familiarization	continuing education of examiners must at focus on techniques rses, examiners should participate in skills- empleted their basic training, the Panel ith other appropriate Agency components, programs for examiners
In the Panel's opinion, the include an array of courses that Then, through a variety of coubuilding courses, Once polygraphers have cobelieves in concert wishould develop familiarization	continuing education of examiners must at focus on techniques rses, examiners should participate in skills- empleted their basic training, the Panel ith other appropriate Agency components, programs for examiners
In the Panel's opinion, the include an array of courses that Then, through a variety of coubuilding courses, Once polygraphers have cobelieves in concert wishould develop familiarization	continuing education of examiners must at focus on techniques rses, examiners should participate in skills- empleted their basic training, the Panel ith other appropriate Agency components, programs for examiners
In the Panel's opinion, the include an array of courses that Then, through a variety of coubuilding courses, Once polygraphers have cobelieves in concert wishould develop familiarization	continuing education of examiners must at focus on techniques rses, examiners should participate in skills- empleted their basic training, the Panel ith other appropriate Agency components, programs for examiners
In the Panel's opinion, the include an array of courses that Then, through a variety of coubuilding courses, Once polygraphers have could be in concert wishould develop familiarization should formalize a represent the best the incentive/retention package.	continuing education of examiners must at focus on techniques rses, examiners should participate in skills- ompleted their basic training, the Panel at the other appropriate Agency components, programs for examiners a system to identify those examiners who has to offer and develop a meaningful
In the Panel's opinion, the include an array of courses that I'hen, through a variety of coubuilding courses, Once polygraphers have could be in concert withould develop familiarization should formalize a represent the best the ncentive/retention package.	continuing education of examiners must at focus on techniques rses, examiners should participate in skills- empleted their basic training, the Panel ith other appropriate Agency components, programs for examiners



_	ounterintelligence in the Agency and throughout the IC.
	two
	ignificant changes directly attributable to the Ames betrayal. On 1 May 1998,
	egan a number of initiatives to improve the process by which referrals to are made.
	experienced examiners were matched with
	mployees who had overseas experience, and the MOU was amended to allow
	to conduct more investigation
	also began planning a
	isk-managed reinvestigation program, based on an individual's access rather than on
2	mployment status,
	This program also
,	rovides for random BIs and polygraphs
	Security and
	I professionals believe, and the Panel concurs, that the risk-managed reinvestigation
	rogram enhances the Agency's security/CI posture.



TEST TECHNIQUES AND PROGRAMMATIC DIFFERENCES

nanmark of un	e program.				
77.79 _{60.0}					
X An employ	ee who has not e				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	may still ha	ve legitimate co	oncerns about		the
uestions. The	may still hase legitimate conc by knowing som	ve legitimate co cerns are based eone who has e	oncerns about on an individua ngaged in the b	al's unique exp ehavior under	erience and question; or
uestions. The lay be caused le employee r	may still has legitimate cond by knowing som any have commit	ve legitimate co cerns are based cone who has en ted a lesser viol	oncerns aboute on an individua ngaged in the b ation that does	al's unique exp ehavior under not meet the tl	erience and question; or areshold of
uestions. The nay be caused ne employee r ne behavior of	may still hase legitimate conc by knowing som	ve legitimate co cerns are based eone who has en ted a lesser viol ortheless causes	oncerns about on an individuangaged in the bation that does a reaction. Wit	al's unique exp behavior under not meet the the hout further di	erience and question; or areshold of scussion, the
uestions. The nay be caused ne employee n ne behavior of olygrapher ha experiences that	may still hat se legitimate cond by knowing some any have commit interest but never a no way of determination the	ve legitimate co cerns are based eone who has en ted a lesser viol ertheless causes mining whether Agency environ	oncerns about on an individual ngaged in the bation that does a reaction. With the reaction is	ehavior under not meet the the hout further di caused by the her the person	erience and question; or areshold of scussion, the se or similar has engaged
uestions. The nay be caused ne employee ra ne behavior of olygrapher ha experiences that a serious wror	may still hat se legitimate concerns by knowing some may have commit interest but never some new of determination of the legitimate. Therefore, and the legitimate in the legitimate concerns and the	ve legitimate co cerns are based eone who has ented a lesser viol ortheless causes mining whether Agency environce, consistent wi	oncerns about on an individual ngaged in the bation that does a reaction. With the reaction is nament, or wheth the the doctrine	ehavior under not meet the the hout further di caused by the her the person that the Agend	erience and question; or areshold of scussion, the se or similar has engaged by does not
uestions. Then ay be caused ne employee rule behavior of olygrapher has periences that a serious wromse the polygraps	may still hat se legitimate cond by knowing some any have commit interest but never a no way of determination the	ve legitimate co cerns are based eone who has en ted a lesser viol ertheless causes mining whether Agency environ e, consistent witter," the polygr	oncerns about on an individual ngaged in the bation that does a reaction. With the reaction is nament, or wheth the doctrine apher is obliga	ehavior under not meet the the hout further di caused by the her the person that the Agend ted to engage t	erience and question; or hreshold of scussion, the se or similar has engaged by does not the employee





		_
		,
•		
	It should be noted, however, that throughout the sequence of events described above, the polygrapher believes that s/he is fulfilling an important responsibility to protect	
	Agency and national security interests and is performing the mission for which s/he was	
	trained.	٦
İ		
-		
-		

CONFUENTIAL



Emphasis on a quality BI and review of financial information would also ndard. Finally, should specific information be developed that suggests a CI, security or ability problem still has the authority to conduct Polygraphs of age in other investigative activity as appropriate. Fundamental to this discussion remains the point that there is no tool available, uding polygraph, that will categorically separate truth from deception. The polygracess, especially in the screening world, relies heavily on the interpersonal and itation skills of the examiner. Agency executives need to culate the direction of the polygraph program.	r
Finally, should specific information be developed that suggests a CI, security or ability problem still has the authority to conduct Polygraphs of age in other investigative activity as appropriate. Fundamental to this discussion remains the point that there is no tool available, uding polygraph, that will categorically separate truth from deception. The polygraph cess, especially in the screening world, relies heavily on the interpersonal and itation skills of the examiner. Agency executives need to	r
Finally, should specific information be developed that suggests a CI, security or ability problem still has the authority to conduct Polygraphs of age in other investigative activity as appropriate. Fundamental to this discussion remains the point that there is no tool available, uding polygraph, that will categorically separate truth from deception. The polygraph cess, especially in the screening world, relies heavily on the interpersonal and itation skills of the examiner. Agency executives need to	r
Finally, should specific information be developed that suggests a CI, security or ability problem still has the authority to conduct Polygraphs of age in other investigative activity as appropriate. Fundamental to this discussion remains the point that there is no tool available, uding polygraph, that will categorically separate truth from deception. The polygraph cess, especially in the screening world, relies heavily on the interpersonal and itation skills of the examiner. Agency executives need to	r
Finally, should specific information be developed that suggests a CI, security or ability problem still has the authority to conduct Polygraphs of age in other investigative activity as appropriate. Fundamental to this discussion remains the point that there is no tool available, uding polygraph, that will categorically separate truth from deception. The polygraph cess, especially in the screening world, relies heavily on the interpersonal and itation skills of the examiner. Agency executives need to	r
Fundamental to this discussion remains the point that there is no tool available, uding polygraph, that will categorically separate truth from deception. The polygracess, especially in the screening world, relies heavily on the interpersonal and itation skills of the examiner. Agency executives need to	
Fundamental to this discussion remains the point that there is no tool available, uding polygraph, that will categorically separate truth from deception. The polygracess, especially in the screening world, relies heavily on the interpersonal and itation skills of the examiner. Agency executives need to	
Fundamental to this discussion remains the point that there is no tool available, uding polygraph, that will categorically separate truth from deception. The polygracess, especially in the screening world, relies heavily on the interpersonal and itation skills of the examiner. Agency executives need to	
Fundamental to this discussion remains the point that there is no tool available, uding polygraph, that will categorically separate truth from deception. The polygracess, especially in the screening world, relies heavily on the interpersonal and itation skills of the examiner. Agency executives need to	ph
uding polygraph, that will categorically separate truth from deception. The polygracess, especially in the screening world, relies heavily on the interpersonal and itation skills of the examiner. Agency executives need to	ph
uding polygraph, that will categorically separate truth from deception. The polygracess, especially in the screening world, relies heavily on the interpersonal and itation skills of the examiner. Agency executives need to	ph .
uding polygraph, that will categorically separate truth from deception. The polygracess, especially in the screening world, relies heavily on the interpersonal and itation skills of the examiner. Agency executives need to	ph .
uding polygraph, that will categorically separate truth from deception. The polygracess, especially in the screening world, relies heavily on the interpersonal and itation skills of the examiner. Agency executives need to	ph
cess, especially in the screening world, relies heavily on the interpersonal and itation skills of the examiner. Agency executives need to	ph
itation skills of the examiner. Agency executives need to]·
Agency executives need to	
culate the direction of the polygraph program.	



We speculate that some percentage of the higher Agency numbers is attributable to the unique mission and responsibilities of Agency officers. We note that, as a post-Ames improvement to the CI posture of the Agency, have codified procedures to review, on a regular basis, the Memory and Memorandum of Understanding that establishes the threshold for case referrals from (C) The Panel applauds the many successful joint efforts conducted by the Agency However, much more must be done.

The Need for Outreach— Dispel the Myths and Educate



Write Success of the Agency's polygraph program in protecting the integrity of the workforce, and by extension national security initiatives, should receive broader dissemination within the Agency. The Panel is mindful of privacy issues and the need to maintain an evenhanded system that does not suggest a "witch hunting" environment. Nevertheless, to the extent possible, the Agency population should be made aware of the continual stream of egregious, disqualifying behavior developed in the polygraph process; and understand that, had it not been for the polygraph, those individuals would likely have been hired.

Panel members discussed at length alternatives to improve the perception of polygraph and instill greater confidence in the personnel security process by education and de-mystification of security vetting. While acknowledging the efforts currently made to explain procedures to applicants and employees alike, the Panel believes that more should be done in this area.



,	
CONFIDE	ENTIAL

		_
		Ì
,		
, [
	Participants should understand the complaint and review process that provides responsible checks and balances	
	responsible checks and balances	
•		
		7
.]		
.		
4	·	
	28	

Workforce relative to the polygraph's role in protecting security interests.	ng Agency and national	
Management Responsibility and Accountability		
The Panel found wide disparity among Agency managers	' approach to polygraph	
ssues—and in how they communicate their views to subording rocessing.	nates undergoing polygraph	1

	······································
(6) We suggest that	develop a polygraph
training module for managers. Such a managers and included in their earlies	t training. The content should ensure
that new managers understand the rol and provide guidance about how to co	e of the polygraph within the Agency, unsel employees who are experiencing

	ction. Development of a computerized algorithm to assist in scoring ts would be an improvement and would eliminate perceived subjectivity.
	The IC overall, and the Agency
• •	I he IC overall, and the Agency s a continuing need to identify scientifically reliable and valid technique ruth from deception. The Panel understands that an entity in the

Accordingly, the Panel recommends that appropriate stakeholders, to include establish a dialogue to identify trends and advancements in neuroscience that are applicable to the overarching issue of deception detection. The most promising research should be identified, and specific funding recommendations should be presented. The Panel believes that this is a true IC issue and, provided the research demonstrates reasonable potential to achieve its goal, the project should be championed as a DCI initiative.

33
CONFIDENTIAL
/ ¥

CONFUENTIAL

A	
CONER	ENTIAL
/[]	

	40/
CONFIL	MIAL
A	reg .
- /	1

	CONFIDENTIAL			~	
ĺ					
İ					
L					

